

1/5

HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW

P.O. Box 366, 751 Kelly Street

Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

Phone 650-712-0340 Fax 650-712-0263

www.HMBay.comMARK HAYNES
FRNIE BEFFEL
WARREN WOLFELDOf Counsel
JIM TIANN
*BILL KENNEDY
KENTA SUZUE

*admitted in MA only

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL FORMRECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FAX NUMBER:	703.872.9306	AUG 09 2004 OFFICIAL
TRANSMITTED TO:	EXAMINER LAURIE ANNE RIES	
OF:	USPTO	
FROM:	Sue Bromaghini, Patent Paralegal <i>Sue Bromaghini</i>	
CLIENT/MATTER:	Application No. 09/944,817	
DATE:	9 August 2004	

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING THIS COVER SHEET:

5

DEAR EXAMINER RIES: THIS IS A FOLLOW-UP TO MY VOICEMAIL MESSAGE I LEFT WITH YOU A COUPLE OF DAYS AGO. THIS IS THE SECOND NOTICE TO THE USPTO, FIRST TO A DIFFERENT EXAMINER FORMERLY ASSIGNED TO THIS CASE, APPARENTLY. WE ARE ERRONEOUSLY LINKED UP WITH THIS CUSTOMER NUMBER AND HAVE RECEIVED AN OFFICE ACTION IN EXCESS OF 20 PAGES ON THIS CASE. THE FIRST FEW PAGES ARE ATTACHED.

PLEASE REDIRECT THIS ACTION TO ANOTHER PARTY, AS WE ARE NOT HANDLING THIS MATTER.

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, PLEASE CALL OUR OFFICE AT THE NUMBER ABOVE.

THANK YOU. SUE BROMAGHINI

ORIGINAL:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	WILL NOT FOLLOW
<input type="checkbox"/>	FOLLOWS VIA AIRMAIL
<input type="checkbox"/>	FOLLOWS VIA COURIER

THE DOCUMENTS ACCOMPANYING THIS TELECOPY TRANSMISSION CONTAIN INFORMATION FROM HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP AND ARE FOR THE SOLE USE OF THE ABOVE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY, AND MAY BE PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER LAW. ANY OTHER DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE IF YOU ARE NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS. WE WILL REIMBURSE YOUR REASONABLE PHONE AND POSTAGE EXPENSE FOR DOING SO.

11/3/05

HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW

P.O. Box 366, 751 Kelly Street

Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

Phone 650 712-0340 Fax 650-712-0263

www.HMBay.com

MARK HAYNES
ERIN BEFFEL
WARREN WOLFELD

Off Counsel:
JIM HANN
BILL KENNEDY
KENTA SUZUI

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL FORM

MAY 05 2004

FAX NUMBER:	703.872.9306
TRANSMITTED TO:	EXAMINER HEATHER HERNDON (COPY TO OIPE)
OF:	USPTO
FROM:	SUE BROMAGHIM
CLIENT/MATTER:	US APPLN. NO. 09/944,817
DATE:	5 May 2004

OFFICIAL

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING THIS COVER SHEET:

3

TO THE ATTENTION OF OIPE AND EXAMINER HERNDON:

THIS CASE HAS BEEN ERRONEOUSLY ASSIGNED TO OUR CUSTOMER NUMBER, AND IT DOES NOT BELONG TO US.

WE HAVE RECEIVED THE TWO ATTACHED DOCUMENTS - NOTICES OF ACCEPTANCE OF POA AND PUBLICATION OF APPLN. PLEASE REDIRECT THESE TO THE PROPER PARTY.

THANK YOU.

ORIGINAL:	
X	WILL NOT FOLLOW
	FOLLOWS VIA AIRMAIL
	FOLLOWS VIA COURIER

THE DOCUMENTS ACCOMPANYING THIS TELECOPY TRANSMISSION CONTAIN INFORMATION FROM HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP AND ARE FOR THE SOLE USE OF THE ABOVE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY, AND MAY BE PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER LAW. ANY OTHER DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE IF YOU ARE NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS. WE WILL REIMBURSE YOUR REASONABLE PHONE AND POSTAGE EXPENSE FOR DOING SO.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

3/5



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,817	08/31/2001	Gene Golovchinsky	FXPL-01001US0	2360
22470	7590	07/29/2004		
HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP P O BOX 366 HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019				
			EXAMINER RIES, LAURIE ANNE	
			ART UNIT 2176	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP
AUG 02 2004
RECEIVED

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/944,817

Applicant(s)

GOLOVCHINSKY ET AL.

Examiner

Laurie Ries

Art Unit

2176

4/5

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C D 11, 453 O G 213

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f)
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1 ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received
- 2 ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
- 3 ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/5/2002
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PAGE 4/5 * RCVD AT 8/9/2004 7:01:26 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXXRF-1/1 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:650 712 0263 * DURATION (mm-ss):01:34

Mail Date 2

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Application/Control Number: 09/944,817

Art Unit: 2176

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Claims 1-38 and 39-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1 through 38 recite a "system for detecting an annotated anchor" which is an abstract idea not tangibly embodied in a computer readable/executable medium.

Claims 39 through 50 recite a "method for detecting and processing a plurality of annotated anchors in a plurality of documents" which is an abstract idea not tangibly embodied in a computer readable/executable medium.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10, 14-20, 22-27, 31, 33, 36-42, 45, and 48-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingram (U.S. Publication 2002/0052890 A1) in further view of Schilit (U.S. Patent 6,279,014 B1).

As per claim 1, Ingram discloses a system, method and apparatus for detecting hyperlinks or anchors within a document when the cursor is moved